

May 10, 2001

AMERICA NOT GETTING FAIR SHAKE FROM UNITED NATIONS -- (House of Representatives - May 10, 2001)

[Page: H2137] [GPO's PDF](#)

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today, as we are getting ready to adjourn, we have left the foreign relations authorization bill unfinished. I serve on the Committee on International Relations, and I was anxious to present several amendments in dealing with especially the United Nations. Unfortunately, those amendments were not permitted.

The amendments that we are dealing with I see as being very small token efforts to improve the bill, but not really dealing with the essence of whether or not we should be in the United Nations or further funding the peacekeeping missions and doing many of the things that I believe sincerely should not be engaged in if we followed the Constitution, and many Americans agree with this.

I think we are at a point now where a growing number of Americans feel like we are not getting a fair shake from the United Nations. I have been preaching this message for quite a few years, but I believe the United Nations itself is starting to make my point.

Just recently, in the last week, the United States was kicked off the Human Rights

Commission, as well as the International Narcotics Control Board. This is an affront to our dignity and ought to point out to us that, although we pay the largest amount of money for peacekeeping missions and the largest amount of dues, here it is that, because there is disagreement, we are humiliated by being kicked off these commissions.

I do not see the benefits of belonging to the United Nations. I see too many disadvantages. If it were just a discussion group and trying to bring people together, that would be one thing; but we have gone to an extreme. This is an extreme position, as far as I am concerned, to belong to the United Nations and deliver so much of our sovereignty to the United Nations today.

Essentially since World War II, we have gone to war under U.N. resolutions. No longer does the President come to the Congress and ask for a declaration of war. U.N. resolutions are passed, and we send our troops throughout the world fighting and being engaged in war. That is not the way it is supposed to be. The Constitution is very clear on when we should be involved in war.

The conditions are not improving at all. They are asking for more and more funding. At the same time we sacrifice more and more of our sovereignty. On occasion we will stand up and say no, we do not want to participate in the Kyoto treaty or the International Criminal Court, and that is good. But the whole idea of this world government under the United Nations I think is something we should really challenge.

Just January of this past year, it was noted that the United Nations proposed for the first time, although not ready to be passed, that we have an international tax placed on currency transactions to raise billions of dollars to be spent for international activities. Now, you say well, that is probably just a proposal and it will never happen. But even today, in Bosnia, the United Nations peacekeepers over there are tax collectors. There are not enough revenues being collected for certain governments, and the UN peacekeepers are

[Page: H2138] [GPO's PDF](#) there collecting taxes. So it is already happening that we are involved in tax collecting.

I think that is the wrong way to go, and certainly we should be considering slashing these funds. I would have liked to have seen the removal of all the funds for peacekeeping missions. There is no national sovereignty reasons why we should put American troops under U.N. command in areas like Bosnia. I think that is the wrong way to go, I do not think the American people support this, and that we should reconsider our position and our relationship in the United Nations.

There are hundreds of millions of dollars here for population control around the world. Some would say, well, as long as we write some little sentence in here and say ``please do not use any of the money for abortion," that will alleviate their conscience about sending tax dollars over to do abortions in places like China and other places in the world. Well, that does not work, because all funds are fungible. Funds can be shifted around. If we send the money, it can be used. If we specifically say ``do not use them," they can just shift the funds around, so I see that as not being a very good idea.

I would like to strike all the funds for population control. If we feel compelled to help other countries and teach them about birth control, it should be done voluntarily and through missionary work or some other way, but not to tax the American people and force them to subsidize events like abortion.